As my hon. friend has stated that even if such Bills are not taken into consideration or are rejected or sent back, the Government have got enough time for that. But since we have to take up Demands continuously, we thought that we would have an evening session when these Bills could be discussed. (Thiru K. Vinayakam : The Hon. the Leader of the House himself is silent.) He is keeping a very serene silence because he has been a member of the party to that arrangement and therefore, he is keeping quiet. But that does not mean that the hon. Member should not question all these things. But what is really amazing to me is that the hon. Member is so vigorous in fighting over a shadow.

திரு. க. இராமமூர்த்தி : ஆன் எ பாயின்ட் ஆஃப் ஆர்டர், சார் இந்த 1967-ம் வருஷத்து ஜெனரல் ஸேல்ஸ் டாக்ஸ் திருத்தச் சட்டத்தைப் பொறுத்தவரையிலும் நோட்டிஃபிகேஷன் ஆன அன்றே அமலுக்கு வந்துவிட்டது. அந்தச் சட்டம் மந்தின தேதியிலிருந்தே அமலுக்கு வந்துவிட்டது. இந்த நிலையிலே இப்படி அவசரமாகச் சட்ட மன்றத்தைக் கூட்டி இந்தச் சட்டத்தைப்பற்றி விவாதிக்க வேண்டிய அவசியம் இல்லை என்று தங்களுக்குத் தெரிவித்துக் கொள்கிறேன்.

திரு. து. ப. அழகமுத்து எழுந்தார்.

மாண்புமிகு பேரவைத் தலைவர் : இதிலே நடைமுறைக் கேள்வி எழுப்பியவர்களையும் அமைச்சர்களையும் தவிர வேறு உறுப்பினர்கள் பேசுவதற்கு இடமில்லை.

On the matter mentioned by the hon. Member Thiru K. Vinayakam that there is sufficient time, the point is whether these bills in fact have retrospective effect or not is not a fully settled question of law. The hon. Member assumes that whatever we pass in this Assembly is automatically passed by the Upper House and returned in two days. Our experience is that Bills passed by this House have been held up by the other House to the maximum extent possible. The other House has power to obstruct non-money Bills to the extent of ninety days. They have not returnd the Madras District Municipalities (Amendment) Bill, 1967, although two months and twenty-nine days have elapsed. They are waiting for the full three months, not even one day less. They have held it up for full three months. They have got power to hold up even Money Bills for fourteen days. I am unable to assume that the Upper House will pass even Money Bills within that period. I will only assume that the maximum length of time should be given to the other House. They may probably want to discuss in detail and the maximum time should be given.

(எ) மேலவையைப்பற்றிக் குறை கூறல்.

THIRU R. PONNAPPA NADAR : On a point of order, Sir, accusing the Upper House of obstruction will amount to a breach of order. When the Upper House is seized of a matter, when

that matter is pending consideration by that Hon. House, will we be in order in saying that this will be obstructing the proceedings of this House?

MR. SPEAKER : What I mean is that the House has delayed the passing of this Bill. 'Obstructing' does not convey the meaning; I will substitute the word 'delaying'. What we actually see is that the Bill is detained in the Upper House to the maximum length of period. Having had that experience, will it be right on our part to assume that even a Money Bill will not be delayed to the maximum number of days allowed by the law? I would certainly be on the side of precaution in getting these Bills passed as early as possible, particularly, because even delay by a day will mean loss of revenue to the Government. Therefore, it is all the more our bounden duty to pass these Bills as early as possible. Having taken everything into consideration, I have allowed a shortening of the time to the Government. I have also allowed a lengthning of the time to the Opposition. Although amendments should be given a few days earlier, I have allowed the Opposition to give notice of amendments up to the very last minute. What has been done is fair to both sides. I will not allow further points of order to be raised. I notice that Mr. Ramamoorthy has raised the same point of order twice. Point of order being raised over and over again will amount to obstruction of the proceedings of the House. The first point of order was exactly the same as the second point of order. If the same Member raises the same point of order, it amounts to obstruction of the proceedings of the House and there are certain rules to deal with that.

THIRU V. GEORGE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, you have submitted that the Business Advisory Committee has decided that this Bill may be taken up on this day. But my submission is that the Business Advisory Committee cannot go against the rules of the Assembly. The rules of the Assembly clearly provide. . . . .

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Member is raising the same point over gain. I am saying that the time laid down for the discussion on the budget and the discussion on the Demands for Grants has been fully allotted. We are sitting extra time. Does not the hon. Member see that it is now 4 o'clock in the afternoon and not 9 o' clock in the morning? We have not committed any breach of either the Rules or the decision of the Business Advisory Committee. The Business Advisory Committee is composed of very experienced Members and leaders of parties. They have gone into every aspect of the matter including the Rules and decided that the Bill should be taken up on the afternoon of the 24th June and therefore I am taking it up in the afternoon.

DR. H. V. HANDE : On a point of order, Sir, a clear decision has been given about a year ago that money bills are not subject to vote in the Upper House, when the Additional Land

1967 ஜூன் 24] [Dr. H. V. HANDE]

Tax Bill came up for consideration. Money Bills are being passed by us. It is incorrect to say that the Government will be put in an awkward position if a Money Bill is not passed.

Mr. SPEAKER : I do not say that it will be passed or not passed. It does not matter at all. But according to the constitution, they have got the power to delay even Money Bills up to a maximum of fourteen days. If the hon. Member will come to my room, I will show him the relevant article. That is the maximum power they have.

7. அரசினர் மசோதாக்கள்.

(அ) தமிழ்நாடு 1967-ம் ஆண்டு மது விலக்கு (திருத்த) மசோதா (சட்டப்பேரவை) மசோதா எண் 5/1967.

* The Hon. Thiru C. N. ANNADURAI : Sir, I move—

'That the Madras Prohibition (Amendment) Bill,[a] 1967 (L.A. Bill No. 5 of 1967) be taken into consideration.

Section 21-A of the Madras Prohibition Act, 1937 (Madras Act X of 1937) provides for the levy of a sale-tax at the rate of fifty naye Paise in the rupee on sales of foreign liquor to permit holders. With a view to providing for an increase in the revenues of this State, which has been found very necessary to facilitate implementation of the schemes of national development in the Fourth Plan, it is proposed to amend section 21-A of the Act so as to increase the rate of sales-tax from fifty naye Paise in the rupee to seventy-five Paise in the rupee. The Bill seeks to the above object.

மாண்புமிகு பேரவைத் தலைவர் : இதற்கு திரு. வி. கே. கோதண்டராமன் அவர்கள் ஒரு திருத்தம் கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். உறுப்பினர் அவர்கள் இப்போது சபையில் இல்லாததால், அவருடைய திருத்தம் திரும்பப் பெற்றுக் கொள்ளப்பட்டதாகக் கருதப்படும். மாண்புமிகு முதலமைச்சர் அவர்களின் "மசோதா ஆய்வுக்கு எடுத்துக் கொள்ளப்பட வேண்டு" மென்று தீர்மானம் இப்போது விவாதத்திற்கு விடப்படுகிறது.

* Thiru K. VINAYAKAM : Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill which seeks to amend the existing Act by increasing the sales tax from fifty paise to seventy-five paise in the rupee over the sale of foreign liquor, to enable the Government to get a larger revenue for executing developmental works. This amending Bill looks very innocuous and innocent in its nature and it gives the impression that the Government intend to increase the sales-tax from 50 Paise to 75 paise. But the increse is very steep. If money alone is the only consideration, I do not see any reason why the Government should not come forward to levy even one rupee on a turnover of one rupee? That would have been all right because after all those people who consume foreign liquor are not பி.ப. 4–00

---

a 1967 ஜூன் 23 தேதியிடப்பட்ட அரசிதழ் தனி வெளியீட்டில் வெளியிடப்பட்டுள்ளது.